



RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 08 2004

2345 Grand Boulevard
Suite 2800
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2684
(816) 292-2000, Fax (816) 292-2001

Direct Dial Number:
(816) 460-5848

www.lathropgage.com

10851 Mastin Blvd.
Building 82, Suite 1000
Overland Park, KS 66210-1669
(913) 451-5100, Fax (913) 451-0875

1845 S. National
Springfield, MO 65808-4288
(417) 886-2000, Fax (417) 886-9128

The Equitable Building, Suite 1300
10 South Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102-1708
(314) 613-2500, Fax (314) 613-2550

4845 Pearl East Circle
Suite 300
Boulder, CO 80301
(720) 931-3000, Fax (720) 931-3001

314 East High Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
(573) 893-4336, Fax (573) 893-5398

1200 G Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-8984, Fax (202) 434-8992

September 8, 2004

From: James M. Stipek

Matter No.: 392531

To:	Company:	Fax Number:	Phone Number:
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	USPTO	1-703-872-9306	703-305-9676 (Examiner Mehmet Geckil)

Number of Pages Transmitted (including this cover sheet): 11

Message: In Re: U.S. Patent Application No. 09/838,993
System and Method for Streaming Media

Enclosed for filing, please find the following: Certificate of Facsimile Transmission (1 page); Transmittal Form (1 page); Fee Transmittal for FY2004 (1 page, in duplicate); Response to Restriction Requirement (1 page); Petition for Extension of Time (1 page, in duplicate); authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 12-0600 in the amount of \$55.00 for the extension fee; and authorization to charge additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 12-0600.

If you have a problem receiving this facsimile, please call: (816) 460-5848

Fax Attendant: _____

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information in this facsimile message ("fax") is sent by an attorney or his/her agent, is intended to be confidential and for the use of only the individual or entity named above. The information may be protected by attorney/client privilege, work product immunity or other legal rules. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are notified that retention, dissemination, distribution or copying of this fax is strictly prohibited. If you receive this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return it to the address above. Thank you.

CC 1327072v1

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION 37 CFR 1.8

Matter No.

Applicant(s): Charles A. Jennings


392531

Serial No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit
09/838,993	April 20, 2001	Mehmet B. Geckil	2142

Invention System And Method For Streaming Media

I hereby certify that this Transmittal Form (1 page); Fee Transmittal for FY 2004 (1 page, in duplicate); Response to Restriction Requirement (4 pages); Petition for Extension of Time (1 page, in duplicate); authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 12-0600 in the amount of \$55.00 for the extension request; and authorization to charge additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 12-0600; are being sent via facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 for Commission for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 8th day of September, 2004.

James M. Stipek
Name of Transmitter


Signature of Transmitter


(703) 872-9306
Facsimile No.

CC1327062v1

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.


TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>		Application Number	09/838,993
		Filing Date	April 20, 2001
		First Named Inventor	Charles A. Jennings
		Art Unit	2142
		Examiner Name	Mehmet B. Geckil
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	392531

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) <i>(please identify below):</i> Certificate of Facsimile Transmission	
		Remarks	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	James M. Stipek LATHROP & GAGE LC
Signature	
Date	September 8, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or printed name	James M. Stipek
Signature	
	Date
	September 8, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-8199 and select option 2.

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 392531

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) Jennings
 Serial No. 09/838,993
 Filed April 20, 2001
 For System and Method for Streaming
 Media

Examiner Geckil, Mehmet B.
 Group Art No. 2142 **RECEIVED**
 Confirmation No. 2725 **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**
SEP 08 2004

September 8, 2004

Commissioner For Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement mailed July 8, 2004,
 Applicant makes the following remarks.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 and § 1.10

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 with sufficient postage:

MAILING


37 C.F.R. § 1.8
 as first class mail.

37 C.F.R. § 1.10
 as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"
 EXPRESS MAIL NO. _____

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office via 703-872-9306 for the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

 James M. Stipek
 Name of Depositor/Transmitter


 Signature

 September 8, 2004
 Date

CC 1327018v1

Remarks

Claims 1-147 are pending. The Examiner restricted claims 1-147 to the following groups.

- I. Claims 1-44, 66-69, 77-117, 136-137, and 147 drawn to a system for streaming media.
- II. Claims 45-59, 70-72, 118-135, 138, and 140-142 drawn to a system for streaming media.
- III. Claims 73-76 and 143-146 drawn to a system for processing media.
- IV. Claims 60-65 drawn to a reservation state model for streaming media.

Applicant traverses the restriction and provisionally elects Group I, claims 1-44, 66-69, 77-117, 136-137, and 147.

To the extent the Examiner determines that Groups I and II should correctly be prosecuted together and not restricted based on the comments below, Applicant provisionally elects Groups I and II with traverse.

The Examiner has incorrectly categorized and characterized the claims in the application. The Examiner has incorrectly placed the claims in different classes and sub-classes.

Regarding Group I, independent claim 1, for example, comprises a media switch, a routing processor, and a management system. Independent claim 1 does not include limitations for a stream castor or a reservation server using a domain name server protocol.

Regarding Group II, independent claim 45, for example, includes a media switch, a routing processor, and a management system. Independent claim 45 does not include limitations for media rules.

Claims depending from independent claim 1 and independent claim 45 include various limitations. Various claims depending from BOTH independent claim 1 and independent claim 45 include, for example, a media rule (Applicant is neither admitting nor denying that it is a same or similar media rule in one or more claims or stating anything about scope). Therefore, this stated reason by the Examiner for restricting Group II is not correct.

The Examiner has mischaracterized the claims and incorrectly classified the claims in different classes and sub-classes. At a minimum, the claims in Groups I and II should be in the same class and sub-class. At a minimum, the claims in Groups I and II should be prosecuted in a single application and should not be restricted.

Regarding Group III, independent claim 73 does not include a limitation for "e-commerce." A media rule is claimed in independent claim 73. A media rule also is claimed in other claims in the other groups (Applicant is neither admitting nor denying that it is a same or similar media rule in one or more claims or stating anything about scope). Admittedly, an order rule is not claimed in claims in other groups. However, an order rule limitation is not enough to place these claims in a different class and sub-class for restriction. This Group III should be in the same class and sub-class as Groups I and II.

Regarding Group IV, independent claim 60 is drawn to a reservation state model. A reservation state model (in one or more embodiments; Applicant is neither admitting nor denying that it is a same or similar reservation state model in one or more claims or stating anything about scope) is included in claims depending from independent claims 1 and 45 for Groups I and II. This Group IV should be in the same class and sub-class as Groups I and II.

Applicant has demonstrated that all claims should be prosecuted in one application and not restricted. At a minimum, Groups I and II should not be restricted and should be prosecuted in one application.

The Examiner stated the inventions are distinct because they are separately usable. The Examiner said the inventions are separately usable because they are classified in separate classes and sub-classes. The Examiner further stated that the search required for each group is different and not co-extensive for examination purposes because the groups are in different classes and sub-classes. These are the only reasons given by the Examiner. The Examiner's argument is circular.

The claims should not be grouped in separate sub-classes. Separate searches are not required for the claims.

The Examiner has not demonstrated that the claims should be grouped in four class and sub-class combinations. The Examiner has not shown that the groups are combinations/sub-combinations. The claims should not be grouped by the Examiner as combination/sub-combinations.

Since the only reason given by the Examiner for the Restriction is that the claims are in different classes and sub-classes, which has been shown to be incorrect, Applicant believes it has successfully shown the claims should not be restricted. At a minimum, the claims in Groups I and II should be prosecuted together and not be restricted.

This is intended to be a complete response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement mailed on July 8, 2004.

Respectfully Submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

By



James M. Stipek, Reg. No 39,388

Lathrop & Gage, L.C.

2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2300

Kansas City, MO 64108

Tel: (816) 460-5848

Fax: (816) 292-2001

Attorney for Applicant(s)